

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-14 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1 and 4 are independent. In light of the amendments and remarks made herein, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 5-7, and 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ueda et al.* (USP 5,748,237) in view of *Hibino et al.* (USP 5,751,343) and *Hattori et al.* (USP 5,739,859); rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ueda et al.* in view of *Hibino et al.* and *Hattori et al.* and further in view of *Etoh* (USP 5,729,289); and rejected claims 8-9 and 13-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ueda et al.* in view of *Hibino et al.* and *Hattori et al.* and further in view of *Kawada et al.* (USP 5,179,437) or *Konishi et al.* (USP 5,461,429).

By this Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 4 to more appropriately recite the present invention. It is respectfully submitted that these amendments are being made without conceding the propriety of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to timely advance prosecution of the present application.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) -  
*Ueda et al./Hibino et al./Hattori et al.***

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner relies on *Ueda et al.* to teach a signal correction circuit and a backlight control circuit for subjecting the applied image signal to a

correction for outdoor display in response to a setting by the setting unit for admission of the outside light without projecting backlight, citing to col. 8, lines 16-25. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's characterization of this reference.

*Ueda et al.* is directed to back lighting and color control arrangement for an LCD-type video camera viewfinder having multiple back lighting sources. The disclosure presents the problem of utilizing a video camera with the back light disposed behind a liquid crystal panel of the color liquid crystal display apparatus. *Ueda et al.* notes that an arrangement of this particular type has a problem when the cameraman uses a video camera outdoors under strong light, since an amount of light from the back light is extremely small as compared with that of the sun light. In this situation, the cameraman perceives the image displayed on the surface of the liquid crystal panel as being extremely dark (col. 1, lines 17-27).

*Ueda et al.* seeks to solve this problem by providing for a viewfinder arrangement for a video camera where an eyepiece is positioned on an end of a viewfinder barrel where the eyepiece is disposed in front of a front surface of a liquid crystal display panel (col. 2, lines 52-58). The viewfinder barrel has an external light admitting window 6 formed through its upper portion above a portion between the liquid crystal display panel 2 and the back light 5 (col. 2, lines 61-63). When both the external light and the light applied from the back light 5 differ, the color is corrected

in order to obtain a color approximate to the natural color under any shooting condition (col. 4, lines 15-21). Thus, the front of the LCD panel is not exposed to direct light externally from the case.

In contrast, the present invention as set forth in claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a liquid crystal display device comprising a signal correction circuit for subjecting the applied image signal to at least one correction selected from the group consisting of a gamma correction, luminance correction, contour correction, hue correction, and color saturation correction to compensate for incident external light on the liquid crystal display panel. *Ueda et al.* provides a viewfinder barrel in order to solve the problem of use of a video camera outdoors under strong light resulting in the image displayed on the liquid crystal panel being extremely dark. As such, *Ueda et al.* fails to teach or suggest the signal correction circuit as provided in claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that *Hibino et al.* and *Hattori et al.* both fail to cure the deficiencies of the teachings of *Ueda et al.*, assuming these references are combinable, which Applicant does not admit. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1, as amended, is allowable over the references as cited by the Examiner.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 3 is allowable for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1 at least based upon its dependency on claim 1. It is further respectfully submitted that claim 4 contains elements similar to those discussed above

with regard to claim 1 and, thus, claim 4, together with claims dependent thereon, are allowable over the references as cited by the Examiner.


Conclusion


Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Catherine M. Voisinet (Reg. No. 52,327) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By   
Marc S. Weiner, #32,181

  
MSW/CMV/jdm  
0905-0248P

P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000

(Rev. 02/12/2004)